

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND	5
III. ARGUMENT	7
A. Plaintiffs' Motion to Clarify Seeks to Obtain Relief Which has Already Been Properly Rejected by this Court	7
B. Plaintiffs' Motion to Clarify Seeks to Impose Unnecessary and Overly Restrictive Limitations on the Army's Ability to Prepare the 2/25 for Combat	10
1. Plaintiffs' "Clarification" Based Upon Limited Information of Their Choosing May Preclude Training that Was Clearly Disclosed by the Army and Approved by the Court	11
2. Plaintiffs' "Clarification" Would Impose Restrictions that Plaintiffs Have Not Justified on Training that Plaintiffs Elected Not to Challenge	15
3. Plaintiffs' "Clarifications" Are Unnecessary Because the Army Has Been Fully Able to Understand and Implement the Injunction Order and There Is No Evidence that the Army Has Failed to Abide by the Current Injunction	18
C. The Current Injunction Order Provides Appropriate Latitude to the Experts and Avoids Taxing the Court with Micro-management of the 2/25's Conversion	19
IV. CONCLUSION	23